

therefore, it does not necessarily include infants, and I agree with you that the word itself [alone, cannot] be brought in proof of Infant Baptism. But we must remember these words were addressed to Jews, and how would they understand the declaration that the promise was to them and their children, their descendants, their posterity? Would they suppose, contrary to what they knew of "little ones" entering into covenant with Jehovah by circumcision, contrary to what they knew of the baptism of the infants of proselytes from the Gentiles, and as some learned men think of their own infants, that their young children were for the first time to be refused the blessings of covenant relation with God? How is it that we never hear one word of dissatisfaction, murmur, or whisper of discontent, at such exclusion, although the converted Jews were so clamorous for the practice of circumcision for infants as well as adults? I consider this entire absence of any remonstrance, the entire silence of the Jewish converts in regard to the exclusion of their infant children, an evidence that there was no such exclusion, but that the children, infants if any, of these converts were baptized. Confirmatory perhaps of this evidence is the fact that we do not read of any of the children of the early converts being baptized when grown up, in the latter part of the Acts of the Apostles, as they were probably baptized in infancy.

The next case you adduce is from Acts viii. 5, in which you try to make it appear that the narrative is against the supposition of infants having been baptized on that occasion. First, you say, "not a word about baptism till the people believed, and